

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided in the present application. Claims 1-29 are currently pending in the instant application. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended and claims 12-29 have been added for the Examiner's consideration. Claims 1-3, 12, 14, 16 and 23 are independent. Reconsideration of the present application is earnestly solicited.

Applicants submit that the subject matter of claims 16-29 is fully supported by the original written description, including, but not limited to, FIGs. 1-10 and the description in the specification corresponding to allowed claims 3-11.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. Specifically, the subject matter of claims 3-11 has been allowed by the Examiner. As discussed in greater detail hereinafter, Applicants submit that the remaining claims should also be allowed and the present application should be permitted to issue.

Drawings

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's indication of acceptance of the formal drawings filed on October 12, 2004.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0054218). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. Without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 2 to clarify the invention for the benefit of the Examiner. Specifically, Applicants submit that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the unique combination of limitations of the claimed invention. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

With respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the unique combination of limitations of the claimed invention, including the feature(s) of a communication device which communicates with an external device which performs audio regeneration, wherein when the subject image is captured, audio regeneration data which at least indicates where non-ambient sound during audio regeneration is stored within the external device is recorded in the recording medium together with the captured image data.

With respect to claim 2, Applicants submit that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the unique combination of limitations of the

claimed invention, including the feature(s) of wherein the image data and audio regeneration data recorded in the recording medium are read out, and the image is displayed in accordance with the image data while regenerating non-ambient sound stored within the external device at image-capturing in accordance with the audio regeneration data stored within the recording medium.

Non-ambient or external sounds stored or pre-recorded on a recording medium in the present invention are regenerated with an image, e.g., such as those in the various tracks of a disc recording medium within the audio regeneration device 70 or from the recording medium (element 42 in the present application) may be regenerated in conjunction with an image.

Applicants submit that the Kobayashi et al. does not teach or suggest the limitations relating to the regeneration of non-ambient sound and/or the storage of data indicative of where the non-ambient sound is stored for each image. The Examiner has pointed to element 132 (audio input) of Kobayashi et al. However, Applicants submit that, as identified by the Examiner, any alleged audio input from element 132 of Kobayashi et al. is first recorded to a memory card (element 102 in Kobayashi). However, no external audio regeneration device is relied upon for the regeneration of non-ambient sound. Accordingly, Kobayashi et al. clearly does not teach or suggest "regenerating the non-ambient sound at the image-capturing in accordance with the

audio regeneration data which is recorded together with the image data and also *in accordance with the audio data which is recorded in the first recording medium.*"

In accordance with the above discussion of the patents relied upon by the Examiner, Applicants respectfully submit that these documents, either in combination together or standing alone, fail to teach or suggest the invention as is set forth by the claims of the instant application.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejection are respectfully requested. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance.

As to the dependent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable due to their dependence upon an allowable independent claim, as well as for additional limitations provided by these claims.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state-of-the-art, no further comments are deemed necessary with respect thereto.

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Docket No. 0879-0268P
Appl. No.: 09/614,919
Art Unit: 2615
Amendment dated June 30, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 30, 2005
Page 19 of 19

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Marc S. Weiner
Reg. No. 32,181

MSW/MTS/cl

P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000